

PR4



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/915,862	07/26/2001	David A. Eatough	884.495US1	7695

21552 7590 12/22/2004

MADSON & METCALF  
GATEWAY TOWER WEST  
SUITE 900  
15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE  
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101

EXAMINER

YIGDALL, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2122

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/915,862

Applicant(s)

EATOUGH ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J. Yigdall

Art Unit

2122

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 October 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17,19-25,27-31 and 33-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-17,19-25,27-31 and 33-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on September 30, 2004 has been entered. Claims 1, 3-17, 19-25, 27-31 and 33-37 are pending.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection, as set forth below.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 3-17, 19-24, 31 and 33-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,634,114 to Shipley (art of record, "Shipley" herein) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,185,734 to Saboff et al. (art made of record, "Saboff" herein) in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,590,056 to Barritz (art made of record, "Barritz" herein).

With respect to claim 1 (currently amended), Shipley discloses a method for managing use of a software code by a selected application program (see, for example, the abstract).

Although Shipley discloses configuring a table for a selected application program, wherein the application program corresponds to at least one designated software code (see, for example, column 6, lines 25-36), wherein the corresponding at least one designated software code is not the software code used by the selected application program (see, for example, column 7, lines 12-13), Shipley does not expressly disclose:

(a) configuring a database having a plurality of application programs, wherein each one of the plurality of application programs corresponds to at least one designated software code, wherein the plurality of application programs includes the selected application program, and wherein the corresponding at least one designated software code is not the software code used by the selected application program.

However, Saboff discloses a registry or database having a plurality of application programs, wherein each one of the plurality of application programs corresponds to at least one designated software code, and wherein the plurality of application programs includes the selected application program (see, for example, FIG. 4 and column 5, lines 22-44). The registry or database enables different users, groups, processes or environments to use different versions of the same library simultaneously, without relinking the application programs (see, for example, column 3, lines 34-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the table of Shipley with the registry or database taught by Saboff, such

Art Unit: 2122

that the version negotiation system disclosed by Shipley could further enable different users, groups, processes or environments to use different versions of the same library simultaneously.

Although Shipley discloses that the application program calls subroutines within the DLL (see, for example, column 4, lines 43-44), and although such calls would be inoperative without the execution environment inherently detecting the calls and invoking the DLL in some fashion, Shipley does not expressly disclose:

(b) detecting the use of the software code, wherein the detecting is not performed by the software code.

However, Barritz discloses detecting the use of software code (see, for example, column 2, line 63 to column 3, line 4), wherein the detecting is performed by a monitoring program, and not by the software code (see, for example, column 6, lines 54-57). The monitoring program enables such features as detecting the use of obsolete versions of the software code (see, for example, column 3, lines 4-8).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the version negotiation system of Shipley with the monitoring program taught by Barritz, so as to detect the use of obsolete versions of the software code.

Although Shipley discloses that the selected application uses and interacts with the DLL (see, for example, FIGS. 2 and 3), and thus the selected application is inherently identified and made known to the DLL, Shipley does not expressly disclose:

(c) identifying the selected application program that is using the software code.

However, Barritz further discloses that the monitoring program identifies the selected application program that is using the software code (see, for example, column 6, lines 58-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the version negotiation system of Shipley with the monitoring program taught by Barritz, so as to identify the selected application program.

Shipley further discloses:

(d) confirming a conflict between the selected application program and the software code (see, for example, column 7, lines 12-18).

With respect to claim 3 (previously presented), Shipley in view Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein configuring the database further includes:

(a) obtaining information relating to at least one of the plurality of application programs and corresponding at least one designated software code in a non-automated fashion (see, for example, Shipley, column 8, lines 23-30, which shows configuring the table or database by obtaining information from the programmer, in a non-automated fashion).

With respect to claim 4 (previously presented), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein at least one of the plurality of application programs is associated with an executable code (see, for example, Shipley, column 4, lines 40-42), and wherein configuring the database further includes:

(a) obtaining information relating to the at least one of the plurality of application programs and the corresponding at least one designated software code by automated examination of the executable code (see, for example, Barritz, column 4, lines 44-47 and 50-53, and column 5, lines 13-16, which shows a surveying program for periodically obtaining information relating to the plurality of application programs by automated examination); and

(b) entering the information into the database (see, for example, Barritz, column 5, lines 30-34, which shows surveying program entering the information into a system configuration log or database).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the version negotiation system of Shipley in view of Saboff with the surveying program taught by Barritz, so as to periodically obtain information relating to the at least one of the plurality of application programs and the corresponding at least one designated software code by automated examination of the executable code.

With respect to claim 5 (previously presented), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein configuring the database further includes:

(a) entering information relating to the at least one of the plurality of application programs and the corresponding at least one designated software code by using a snapshot of installation activity required for the at least one of the plurality of application programs (see, for example, Barritz, column 4, lines 44-47, and column 9, lines 41-47, which shows a surveying program for entering information relating to the plurality of application programs based on installation activity, so as to automatically keep the information current).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the version negotiation system of Shipley in view of Saboff with the surveying program taught by Barritz, so as to automatically keep the database current with information relating to the at least one of the plurality of application programs and the corresponding at least one designated software code.

With respect to claim 6 (previously presented), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein at least one of the plurality of applications programs is associated with a system resident installation package, and wherein configuring the database further includes:

(a) entering information relating to the at least one of the plurality of application programs and the corresponding at least one designated software code by automated examination of the system resident installation package (see, for example, Barritz, column 4, lines 44-47, and column 9, lines 41-47, which shows a surveying program for entering information relating to the plurality of application programs based on a software installation, so as to automatically keep the information current; also see, for example, Barritz, column 5, lines 30-34, which shows the surveying program consulting a knowledge base, and lines 40-62, which shows that the knowledge base includes information provided by the software vendor).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the software installation disclosed by Barritz using an installation package resident on the system. Such installation packages are common in the art, and would serve to provide the information from the vendor to the knowledge base, as further disclosed by Barritz. Subsequently, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to supplement the version negotiation system of Shipley in view of Saboff with the surveying program taught by Barritz, so as to automatically keep the database current with information relating to the at least one of the plurality of application programs and the corresponding at least one designated software code.



With respect to claim 7 (previously presented), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein confirming a conflict between the software code and the selected application program further includes:

(a) determining that the software code is not the same as the corresponding at least one designated software code (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 8-18).

With respect to claim 8 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein the corresponding at least one designated software code has a version number which differs from a version number associated with the software code used by the selected application program (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 8-18, which shows differing version numbers), and wherein determining that the improper software code is not the same as the corresponding at least one designated software code further includes:

(a) determining the version number of the corresponding at least one designated software code and the version number of the software code used by the selected application program (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 8-10 and 17-18, which shows determining the version numbers); and

(b) comparing the version number of the corresponding at least one designated software code to the version number of the software code used by the selected application program (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 10-11, which shows comparing the version numbers).

With respect to claim 9 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein the software code is a software library (see, for example,

Art Unit: 2122

Shipley, column 4, lines 37-40, which shows a dynamic link library), and wherein detecting use of the software code further includes:

(a) enabling detection of a library loading operation (see, for example, Barritz, column 6, lines 58-60, which shows detecting a library loading operation).

With respect to claim 10 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein enabling detection of a library loading operation further includes:

(a) setting a software hook activated by the library loading operation (see, for example, Barritz, column 8, lines 25-35).

With respect to claim 11 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses:

(a) configuring a database having a plurality of application programs, wherein each one of the plurality of application programs corresponds to at least one designated software code, wherein the plurality of application programs includes the selected application program (see, for example, Saboff, FIG. 4 and column 5, lines 22-44), and wherein the corresponding at least one designated software code is the same as the software code used by the selected application program (see, for example, Shipley, column 6, lines 39-40 and 51-52).

With respect to claim 12 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein identifying the selected application program further includes:

(a) determining a file name of the selected application program (see, for example, Barritz, column 6, lines 58-65, and column 5, lines 2-4).

With respect to claim 13 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein the selected application program has an application version number (see, for example, Shipley, column 6, lines 2-7), and wherein identifying the selected application program further includes:

(a) determining the application version number (see, for example, Shipley, column 6, lines 24-26).

With respect to claim 14 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses:

(a) reporting the conflict (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 14-17); and  
(b) alerting a selected party regarding the conflict (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 28-30, which shows alerting a selected party with an error message).

With respect to claim 15 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses the limitation wherein the selected party is an end user of the selected application program (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 30-33, which shows alerting the user).

With respect to claim 16 (original), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz further discloses:

(a) reporting the conflict (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 14-17); and  
(b) activating an alarm (see, for example, Shipley, column 7, lines 28-30, which shows activating an error trap or alarm).

With respect to claim 17, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 1 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 1 above). Note that Shipley further discloses a computer workstation comprising a processor module and a machine-accessible medium (see, for example, FIG. 6).

With respect to claim 19, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 4 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 4 above).

With respect to claim 20, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 7 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 7 above).

With respect to claim 21, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 8 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 8 above).

With respect to claim 22, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 9 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 9 above).

With respect to claim 23, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 10 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 10 above).

With respect to claim 24, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 11 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 11 above).

With respect to claim 31, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 1 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 1 above). Note that Shipley further discloses a machine-accessible medium (see, for example, FIG. 6).

With respect to claim 33, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 4 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 4 above).

With respect to claim 34, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 7 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 7 above).

With respect to claim 35, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 8 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 8 above).

With respect to claim 36, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 9 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 9 above).

With respect to claim 37, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 11 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 11 above).

5. Claims 25 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz, and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,960,204 to Yinger et al. (art of record, "Yinger" herein).

With respect to claim 25, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 1 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 1 above).

Although Barritz discloses that the monitoring program may operate in a computer system network (see, for example, Barritz, column 11, lines 26-38), Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz does not expressly disclose:

(a) a server to perform the recited method steps; and

Art Unit: 2122

(b) a client communicatively coupled to the server, wherein execution of the selected application program is initiated by the client.

However, Yinger discloses a server and a client communicatively coupled to the server by a computer system network (see, for example, FIG. 4). The client initiates the execution of a selected application program (see, for example, column 7, lines 48-62). The client/server system enables the application program to be automatically updated to the most recent version (see, for example, column 2, lines 1-9). Yinger further discloses that the application program corresponds to at least one designated software code, such as a DLL (see, for example, column 8, lines 7-16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement the version negotiation system of Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz in a computer system network comprising a server and client as taught by Yinger, so as to automatically update the software when there is a conflict.

With respect to claim 27, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 4 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 4 above).

With respect to claim 28, Shipley in view of Saboff in view of Barritz in view of Yinger further disclose the limitation wherein the database is stored on the server (see, for example, Yinger, column 6, lines 40-43 and 53-55).

With respect to claim 29, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 7 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 7 above).

With respect to claim 30, the limitations recited in the claim are analogous to the limitations recited in claim 11 (see Shipley, Saboff and Barritz as applied to claim 11 above).

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant's disclosure. U.S. Pat. No. 6,351,847 to Sakamoto et al. discloses a method and device for acquiring usage data of applications.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is (571) 272-3707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30am to 4:00pm.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MY

mjy

Michael J. Yigdall  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2122

  
TUAN DAM  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER